

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

PIN	4696	COUNTY	Multiple Counties
APPLICANT	Cottonwood Creek Watershed Group	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$357,000
PROJECT TITLE	Cottonwood Creek Watershed Erosion Inventory	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$359,400

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The purpose of this concept proposal is to conduct an erosion inventory for the Cottonwood Creek Watershed. The Cottonwood Creek drainage area lies within Shasta and Tehama counties on the northwest side of northern California's Central Valley. The lower two-thirds of the drainage area lie in Central Valley uplands, and the upstream portion includes the east slope of the North Coast Mountain Range and Klamath Mountains and the southern slopes of the Trinity Mountains. The mainstream of Cottonwood Creek flows eastward through the valley to the Sacramento River, the confluence lying approximately 16 miles north of Red Bluff. The watershed drains approximately 938 square miles. With an annual runoff of 586,000 acre-feet, Cottonwood Creek is the third largest watershed tributary west of the Sacramento River and the largest undammed tributary in the upper Sacramento River basin. After Cache Creek, Cottonwood Creek provides the largest sediment input to Sacramento River (CALFED, 1997).

WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

Score: 6

Comment: The proposal lists work items with corresponding descriptions, a schedule, and a budget. Work items should have included sub-tasks with associated milestones and work staff type for each task. The schedule is not consistent. Some tasks only include due dates, where other tasks include timelines. No hours, cost rates, or other budget related documentation is given. Project deliverables are a QAPP, a road inventory, and analysis and prioritization of the road inventory based on sediment input. Specifics of each work item are limited and there is no way to see if the budget for each item is reasonable. This work plan does not propose to develop an IRWMP.

DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The description of the region is incomplete and it does not identify the local agencies with statutory authority over water management. The description of the quality and quantity of water resources and demand of the region was not adequately addressed. Internal boundaries relevant to water and wastewater service areas and groundwater basins are not mentioned. No mention of social and cultural makeup of the region. Social and cultural values, economic conditions, and trends are not stated.

OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 2

Comment: Regional planning objectives are listed, although it is not stated how the objectives were determined. Conflicts in the region are not adequately addressed by their objectives. The only plan objective is to inventory soil erosion impacts in the region affecting the Creek. Other needed objectives (e.g., water supply and groundwater management, etc.) will not be addressed by the project. Except for the Regional Board's WMI Chapter and NPS program priorities, discussion of other statewide priorities is limited.

INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 2

Comment: The proposal lists multiple water management strategies, but there is no explanation of how they were determined. The proposal does not state an understanding of how selected water management strategies will work together to produce synergistic effects. The proposal does not address how the various existing management plans are incorporated into an integrated strategy to manage the region's water supply.

IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 2

Comment: This project would not produce an IRWMP so there is no schedule or institutional structure to implement an IRWMP that is not going to be created. There is no proposed monitoring of performance for the non-existent IRWMP.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 2

Comment: This project will not develop an IRWM plan. The proposal does not meet the intent of the IRWM Program and is not a viable integrated regional strategy for management of water resources for projects that protect the communities from drought, protect and improve water quality, and improve local water security by reducing dependence on imported water. The application only proposes to study erosion impacts. Impacts and benefits cannot be evaluated because there will not be an IRWM plan produced. CEQA would be addressed by a categorical exemption.

DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The proposal lists some technical analysis that supports a road inventory project, but the data does not directly support an IRWMP.

DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 1

Comment: The process for gathering and managing information is not described. There is only a mention as to the software that will be used. This is not a proposal for an IRWMP; it is a proposal for a road-related sediment inventory project. There is no reference to development or implementation of an IRWMP. No mention of how the data management will support statewide data needs. Data collected from the road study will be made available to stakeholders and agencies.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The applicant already has a strong stakeholder process in place. This proposal does not develop an IRWMP for the stakeholders to have input on. Environmental justice concerns are not directly addressed.

DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The region contains a DAC and the rural area of the region is apparently disadvantaged. The water supply and water quality needs of the DACs are not addressed. Benefits to DACs are not defined.

RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 1

Comment: The proposal does not identify water management strategies and the dynamics between the two levels of planning documents. The proposal does not intend to produce an IRWMP or a strategy that could be integrated into existing local planning efforts. Local planning documents are not shown to provide support for this project. County planning documents may relate to this project but it is not identified how.

AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 1

Comment: There will be no IRWMP created by this proposed project so there will be no opportunities to coordinate between agencies under the project. The only method for coordinating with agencies appears to be through the applicant's Technical Advisory Committee. If coordination with agencies is facilitated by this project, it will only be on the narrow subject of soil erosion from roads.

TOTAL SCORE:26